UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/587,130	12/28/2007 Bernd Rech		23672	3123
535 KF ROSS PC	7590 12/16/201	0	EXAMINER	
5683 RIVERDA		BERMAN, JASON		
SUITE 203 BO BRONX, NY 1		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1724	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/16/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

EMAIL@KFRPC.COM ereyes@kfrpc.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/587,130	RECH ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Jason M. Berman	1724		

	Jason M. Berman	1724					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED <u>27 November 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appelor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Coperiods:	the same day as filing a Notice of A replies: (1) an amendment, affidavited al (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request				
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b), ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE r).	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FILE	n. LED WITHIN TWO				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extra under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	te extension fee e action; or (2) as				
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with the process.	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
AMENDMENTS							
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better. 	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);					
appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a contract of the contract	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			TOL 00.4				
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):							
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 	owable if submitted in a separate, t	imely filed amendmer	it canceling the				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:		l be entered and an ex	planation of				
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bubecause applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appear and was not earlier presented. Se	ıl and/or appellant fails ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a				
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	itry is below or attache	ed.				
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet. 	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowand	ce because:				
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s).	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).						
13. Other:	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,						
/Nam X Nguyen/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1753							

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant argues in the remarks that Xiong is not applicable to the instant invention because Xiong does not provide stabilization in the transition mode. The abstract of Xiong discloses "preferably the operation point is selected at or near the hysteresis transition edge to provide high rate deposition of high quality films." It is therefore unclear why it would not be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to operation within the transition mode.

In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning and piecemeal addition of multiple references, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See In re McLaughlin, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971). Each of the prior art references disclose known processes and process conditions for the deposition and optical layer formation art.